

KEK-TH-445
 KEK preprint 95-125
 ICRR-Report-341-95-7
 TU-485
 hep-ph/9510286
 October 1995

$B^0-\overline{B}^0$ mixing and ϵ_K parameter in the minimal supergravity model

Toru GOTO¹, Takeshi NIHEI² and Yasuhiro OKADA³

¹*Department of Physics, Tohoku University
 Sendai 980-77 Japan*

²*Institute for Cosmic Ray Research, University of Tokyo
 3-2-1 Midori-cho, Tanashi-shi, Tokyo 188 Japan*

³*Theory Group, KEK, Tsukuba, Ibaraki, 305 Japan*

Abstract

$B^0-\overline{B}^0$ mixing and a CP violation parameter in $K^0-\overline{K}^0$ mixing ϵ_K are studied in the minimal supergravity model. We solve the one-loop renormalization group equations for the minimal supersymmetric standard model (MSSM) parameters numerically in order to determine the masses and mixings of the supersymmetric particles, while all off-diagonal (generation mixing) elements and phases of Yukawa coupling matrices and those of squark mass matrices are taken into account. Applying the radiative electroweak symmetry breaking condition and phenomenological constraints including the recent measurement of the $b \rightarrow s \gamma$ inclusive branching ratio, we obtain the allowed parameter region. We have found that the present constraints still allow a parameter region where both $B^0-\overline{B}^0$ mass splitting ΔM_B and ϵ_K are $\sim 20\%$ larger than the standard model values. By explicit numerical calculations, we have also found that the complex phase of $B^0-\overline{B}^0$ mixing matrix element in this model is almost the same as the standard model value in a good accuracy in the whole allowed parameter region. It is shown that ΔM_B and ϵ_K can put useful constraints on the supersymmetry's parameter space when the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa matrix elements are determined through the measurements of CP violations in B decay with future B -factories.

I Introduction

Supersymmetry (SUSY) is one of the most favorable candidate for new physics beyond the standard model (SM). The minimal supersymmetric standard model (MSSM), which is the most straightforward supersymmetric extension of SM, has been intensively studied for years. MSSM has many new particles such as superpartners of ordinary particles and extra Higgs bosons. Though these SUSY particles are sufficiently heavy to evade the direct search in the present accelerator experiments, they may give measurable contributions to low energy phenomena such as flavor changing neutral currents (FCNC) and CP violations through the radiative corrections [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8].

MSSM has two kinds of sources of flavor mixings: a Yukawa coupling sector and a SUSY breaking sector. The Higgs sector of MSSM is a special case of two Higgs doublet model (THDM) categorized as model II [9], in which up-type (electric charge $2/3$) quarks and down-type (electric charge $-1/3$) quarks get masses from vacuum expectation values of different Higgs doublet fields and hence there is no tree level FCNC. After the diagonalization of quark mass matrices, flavor mixing between quarks appears in the coupling with W boson, just as in the SM, and in the coupling with the physical charged Higgs boson. Both flavor mixings are described by the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa (CKM) matrix with three mixing angles and one CP violating complex phase.

The other source of flavor mixing and CP violation lies in the SUSY breaking sector which involves SUSY particles. Since SUSY is softly broken, squark masses do not have to be diagonalized in the same flavor basis as that for quarks. For a general SUSY breaking sector, the SUSY contributions to the FCNC and/or CP violating processes can easily dominate over the SM contributions. Such a model is strongly constrained by the present experiments on the $K^0-\bar{K}^0$ mixing [1] and the neutron electric dipole moment [2].

Minimal supergravity (SUGRA) provides an attractive framework for the SUSY breaking sector of MSSM [10]. In the minimal SUGRA model, SUSY is assumed to be spontaneously broken in the “hidden” sector which couples to the “observable” MSSM sector only gravitationally so that the interactions between the hidden and the observable sectors are suppressed by $O(M_{\text{Planck}}^{-1})$. The induced soft SUSY break-

ing terms have a universal structure: all soft SUSY breaking masses of squarks and sleptons are degenerate, all trilinear scalar couplings are proportional to the corresponding Yukawa couplings, *etc.* In such a case, the flavor mixings in both quark sector and squark sector are essentially determined by the CKM parameters. Imposing the universal structure on the soft SUSY breaking parameters at a high energy scale such as the GUT scale, one can evaluate the soft SUSY breaking parameters and the Higgs potential at the electroweak scale by solving renormalization group equations (RGEs). As a result of the renormalization effects by the large third generation Yukawa couplings, the Higgs potential is modified so that the electroweak symmetry breaking occurs. This is called the radiative electroweak symmetry breaking scenario [11]. Flavor mixings in the squark sector are also determined by the RGEs. The first and the second generations of squarks are highly degenerate so that the constraint from the K_L - K_S mass splitting is easily satisfied. Furthermore, if we assume that all SUSY breaking parameters are real at the GUT scale, the neutron electric dipole moment is sufficiently suppressed [2].

Although many analyses of the minimal SUGRA model based on the above scenario have been published in literature [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10], an extensive study on the FCNC processes is missing which takes into accounts the radiative electroweak symmetry breaking scenario and recent experimental results, such as the determination of the top quark mass [12] and the measurement of $b \rightarrow s \gamma$ inclusive branching ratio [13]. In particular, from the recent theoretical studies on the $b \rightarrow s \gamma$ process [5], it is shown that relatively light charged Higgs and/or SUSY particles are still allowed since the SUSY particles' contributions to this process can cancel the charged Higgs contribution depending on the sign of the higgsino mass parameter. Therefore, it is important to determine how such light charged Higgs and/or SUSY particles contribute to other FCNC processes.

The purpose of the present paper is to study the FCNC and CP violation in the framework of the minimal SUGRA model. We focus on three quantities: the complex phase of the B^0 - $\overline{B}^0$ mixing matrix element $M_{12}(B) \equiv e^{i\theta_B} |M_{12}(B)|$, which is related to the CP violation in B meson decays, B^0 - $\overline{B}^0$ mass splitting $\Delta M_B = 2|M_{12}(B)|$, and the ϵ_K parameter of the CP violation in the K^0 - $\overline{K}^0$ system. Unlike the K_L - K_S mass splitting ΔM_K in which the long distance contribution cannot be neglected, ΔM_B and ϵ_K are supposed to be dominated by the short distance physics [14], thus

can be sensitive to new physics contributions. In most of the previous works [3, 7, 8], $B^0-\overline{B}^0$ and $K^0-\overline{K}^0$ mixing in MSSM are studied with some simplified treatments on the SUSY particle masses and mixing angles, such as: approximate solutions of the RGEs which are obtained by neglecting Yukawa couplings other than that of top quark are used; or a simple form of mass matrices at the electroweak scale is assumed. On the contrary, in the present analysis, we obtain all mass matrices of SUSY particles from the universal soft SUSY breaking parameters at the GUT scale by a straightforward numerical calculation. We include all complex elements of Yukawa coupling matrices and of squark mass matrices in solving one-loop RGEs for all MSSM parameters with the universal boundary conditions explained above. We then evaluate the effective potential for the Higgs fields at the electroweak scale to find a consistent $SU(2)\times U(1)$ breaking minimum in accordance with the radiative electroweak symmetry breaking scenario. The obtained mass matrices of all particles are diagonalized to evaluate the flavor mixing in the squark sector. The mass spectrum and the mixing are then used to calculate $B^0-\overline{B}^0$ and $K^0-\overline{K}^0$ mixing matrix elements. Along this outline, FCNC processes in B decays and $B^0-\overline{B}^0$ mixing in the minimal SUGRA model are studied previously in Ref. [4]. Compared with this work, we improve the following points: ϵ_K is also considered; one-loop correction to the effective Higgs potential [15] is included to determine the electroweak symmetry breaking; no special relation between soft SUSY breaking parameters A and B (see Sec. II) is assumed; and experimental constraints by LEP *etc.* are updated [16, 17], as well as the top quark mass and $b \rightarrow s \gamma$ branching ratio. It is found that the SUSY contributions do not change the phase of the $B^0-\overline{B}^0$ mixing θ_B from the SM value appreciably for the whole SUSY breaking and CKM parameter space we considered. As for ΔM_B and ϵ_K , we find that all the contributions from charged Higgs and SUSY particles have the same sign as the SM contribution and that a parameter region in which both ΔM_B and ϵ_K are $\sim 20\%$ larger than the standard model values is allowed by the present constraints. We also find that there is a linear correlation between the ratio of ΔM_B to its SM value and that of ϵ_K .

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In the next section the minimal SUGRA model is introduced to clarify the notations and the assumptions which we adopt in this paper. In Sec. III, our results of numerical analyses are presented. Sec. IV is devoted for discussion and conclusions. Formulae for functions from loop

integrals and QCD correction factors are summarized in the Appendices.

II Minimal SUGRA model

MSSM contains three generations of matter (left-handed) chiral superfields Q_i ($\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{2}, 1/6$), D_i ($\bar{\mathbf{3}}, \mathbf{1}, 1/3$) and U_i ($\bar{\mathbf{3}}, \mathbf{2}, -2/3$) for quark supermultiplets, L_i ($\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2}, -1/2$) and E_i ($\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}, 1$) for lepton supermultiplets, where $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ quantum numbers are expressed in each bracket and the suffix $i = 1, 2, 3$ is the generation index, and two Higgs doublets H_1 ($\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2}, -1/2$) and H_2 ($\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2}, 1/2$), as well as vector superfields for gauge multiplets. Yukawa coupling and supersymmetric Higgs mass terms are described by the superpotential W_{MSSM} as

$$W_{\text{MSSM}} = f_D^{ij} Q_i^{a\alpha} D_{ja} H_{1\alpha} + f_U^{ij} \epsilon_{\alpha\beta} Q_i^{a\alpha} U_{ja} H_2^\beta + f_L^{ij} \epsilon^{\alpha\beta} E_i L_{j\alpha} H_{1\beta} + \mu H_{1\alpha} H_2^\alpha, \quad (2.1)$$

where f_D , f_U and f_L are Yukawa coupling constants for down-type quarks, up-type quarks and leptons, respectively, the suffices $a, b, c = 1, 2, 3$ and $\alpha, \beta = 1, 2$ are $SU(3)$ and $SU(2)$ indices, respectively. $\epsilon_{\alpha\beta}$ and $\epsilon^{\alpha\beta}$ are antisymmetric tensors with $\epsilon_{12} = \epsilon^{12} = 1$.

Throughout the calculation hereafter, we choose the basis in the generation space for the superfields such that the Yukawa coupling constants for up-type quarks f_U and leptons f_L are to be diagonal at the electroweak scale. The Yukawa terms in (2.1) are then written as

$$W_{\text{Yukawa}}(m_Z) = \hat{f}_D^{kj} \left(V_{\text{KM}}^\dagger \right)_k^i Q_i D_j H_1 + \hat{f}_U^{ij} Q_i U_j H_2 + \hat{f}_L^{ij} E_i L_j H_1, \quad (2.2)$$

where the notation “ $\hat{}$ ” stands for a diagonal matrix. All eigenvalues of $\hat{f}_D$, $\hat{f}_L$ and $\hat{f}_U$ are taken to be real positive. We use the standard parameterization in Ref. [18]* for the CKM matrix V_{KM} .

In addition to the supersymmetric Lagrangian to be derived from (2.1), the following soft SUSY breaking terms are included:

$$- \mathcal{L}_{\text{soft}} = (m_Q^2)_i^j \tilde{q}_i \tilde{q}^{\dagger j} + (m_D^2)_i^j \tilde{d}^{\dagger i} \tilde{d}_j + (m_U^2)_i^j \tilde{u}^{\dagger i} \tilde{u}_j$$

* In the Wolfenstein parametrization [19] the V_{KM} is parametrized by four parameters (λ, A, ρ, η) . The parameters ρ and η are written as $\rho + i\eta = -(V_{ub}^* V_{ud}) / (V_{cb}^* V_{cd})$ neglecting the higher order terms of the Cabibbo angle $\lambda = V_{us}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
& +(m_E^2)^i{}_j \tilde{e}_i \tilde{e}^{\dagger j} + (m_L^2)_i{}^j \tilde{l}^i \tilde{l}_j \\
& + \Delta_1^2 h_1^\dagger h_1 + \Delta_2^2 h_2^\dagger h_2 - (B\mu h_1 h_2 + \text{h. c.}) \\
& + \left(A_D^{ij} \tilde{q}_i \tilde{d}_j h_1 + A_U^{ij} \tilde{q}_i \tilde{u}_j h_2 + A_L^{ij} \tilde{e}_i \tilde{l}_j h_1 + \text{h. c.} \right) \\
& + \left(\frac{M_1}{2} \tilde{B} \tilde{B} + \frac{M_2}{2} \tilde{W} \tilde{W} + \frac{M_3}{2} \tilde{G} \tilde{G} + \text{h. c.} \right) . \tag{2.3}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{q}_i, \tilde{d}_i, \tilde{u}_i, \tilde{e}_i, \tilde{l}_i, h_1$ and h_2 are scalar components of $Q_i, D_i, U_i, E_i, L_i, H_1$ and H_2 , respectively, and $\tilde{B}, \tilde{W}$ and $\tilde{G}$ are U(1), SU(2) and SU(3) gauge fermion fields (bino, wino and gluino), respectively. SU(2) and SU(3) suffices are omitted in (2.3) for simplicity. In the minimal SUGRA model, SUSY is assumed to be spontaneously broken in the hidden sector which couples to the observable sector (MSSM in the present case) only gravitationally, and hence universal soft SUSY breaking terms are induced in the observable sector. Here, we assume that the soft SUSY breaking parameters satisfy the following relations at the GUT scale:

$$\begin{aligned}
(m_Q^2)^i{}_j &= (m_E^2)^i{}_j = m_0^2 \delta^i{}_j , \\
(m_D^2)_i{}^j &= (m_U^2)_i{}^j = (m_L^2)_i{}^j = m_0^2 \delta_i{}^j , \\
\Delta_1^2 &= \Delta_2^2 = m_0^2 , \\
A_D^{ij} &= f_{DX}^{ij} A_X , \quad A_L^{ij} = f_{LX}^{ij} A_X , \quad A_U^{ij} = f_{UX}^{ij} A_X , \\
M_1 &= M_2 = M_3 = M_{gX} , \tag{2.4}
\end{aligned}$$

where the suffix “X” stands for the value at the GUT scale. We also assume that A_X, M_{gX} and μ are all real parameters. Therefore, no new CP violating complex phase (other than that in CKM matrix) is introduced in the present analysis. Although two physical complex phases among these soft SUSY breaking parameters are possible in principle, such phases lead to a large neutron electric dipole moment in general and are strongly constrained [2].

Below the GUT scale, radiative corrections modify all parameters in the superpotential (2.1) and the soft SUSY breaking terms (2.3), as well as three gauge coupling constants g_1, g_2 and g_3 for U(1), SU(2) and SU(3), respectively. The evolution of the parameters are described by the RGEs [3, 4]. According to the radiative

SU(2) $\times$ U(1) breaking scenario [11], we numerically solve the RGEs down to the electroweak scale m_Z and evaluate the effective potential for the neutral Higgs fields:

$$\begin{aligned}
V(\text{Higgs}) &= V_{\text{tree}} + V_{1\text{-loop}} , \\
V_{\text{tree}} &= (\mu^2 + \Delta_1^2) |h_1|^2 + (\mu^2 + \Delta_2^2) |h_2|^2 - (B\mu h_1 h_2 + \text{h. c.}) \\
&\quad + \frac{g_1^2 + g_2^2}{8} (|h_1|^2 - |h_2|^2)^2 ,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

where $V_{1\text{-loop}}$ is the one-loop correction to the effective potential induced by the Yukawa couplings for the third generation [15]. We have imposed that the electroweak symmetry is broken properly and gives the relation

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle h_1 \rangle &= v \cos \beta , \quad \langle h_2 \rangle = v \sin \beta , \\
m_Z^2 &= \frac{g_2^2}{2 \cos^2 \theta_W} v^2 ,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

where θ_W is the Weinberg angle and β is the angle for the vacuum expectation values of the two Higgs fields. The magnitudes of μ and B in (2.5) are determined by the condition (2.6).

New flavor mixings in the quark–squark–gaugino and quark–squark–higgsino couplings come from diagonalization of the quark mass matrices as well as the squark ones. The mass matrix for up-type squarks is expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}
-\mathcal{L}(\text{s-up mass}) &= (\tilde{q}_u, \tilde{u}^\dagger) \mathcal{M}_u^2 \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{q}_u^\dagger \\ \tilde{u} \end{pmatrix} , \\
&= (\tilde{q}_{ui}, \tilde{u}^{\dagger i}) \begin{pmatrix} (m_{LL}^2)_j^i & (m_{LR}^2)^{ij} \\ (m_{RL}^2)_{ij} & (m_{RR}^2)_i^j \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{q}_u^{\dagger j} \\ \tilde{u}_j \end{pmatrix} , \\
(m_{LL}^2)_j^i &= (M_U M_U^\dagger)_j^i + (m_Q^2)_j^i + m_W^2 \cos 2\beta \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{6} \tan^2 \theta_W \right) \delta_j^i , \\
(m_{RR}^2)_i^j &= (M_U^\dagger M_U)_i^j + (m_U^2)_i^j + m_W^2 \cos 2\beta \left(\frac{2}{3} \tan^2 \theta_W \right) \delta_i^j , \\
(m_{LR}^2)^{ij} &= \mu M_U^{ij} \cot \beta + A_U^{ij} v \sin \beta , \\
m_{RL}^2 &= m_{LR}^{2\dagger} ,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.7}$$

where M_U is the up-type quark mass matrix $M_U^{ij} = f_U^{ij} v \sin \beta$ and $\tilde{q}_u$ is the up-type component of the SU(2) doublet $\tilde{q}$. Note that even if we take the basis in which M_U is diagonalized as Eq. (2.2), the squark mass matrix $\mathcal{M}_u^2$ is not diagonalized simultaneously since, due to the renormalization effect, off-diagonal elements are induced in the soft SUSY breaking parameter matrices. Squark mass basis is obtained by diagonalizing (2.7) with a 6×6 unitary matrix $\tilde{U}_U$:

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{u}'_I &= (\tilde{U}_U)_I^J \tilde{u}_J, \quad I = 1, 2, \dots, 6, \\ \tilde{u}_I &= \begin{cases} \tilde{q}_{uI} & \text{for } I = 1, 2, 3 \\ \tilde{u}_{I-3}^\dagger & \text{for } I = 4, 5, 6 \end{cases}, \\ \tilde{U}_U^\dagger \mathcal{M}_u^{2\text{T}} \tilde{U}_U &= \text{diagonal},\end{aligned}\tag{2.8}$$

where $\tilde{u}'_I$ is the mass eigenstate of up-type squark and T stands for transposition. The mass bases of down-type squarks are obtained in the same way with 6×6 unitary matrices $\tilde{U}_D$. The flavor mixings in the quark–squark–gaugino and the quark–squark–higgsino coupling are described by the mixing matrices $\tilde{U}_U, \tilde{U}_D$ and the CKM matrix.

$B^0\text{--}\overline{B}^0$ and $K^0\text{--}\overline{K}^0$ mixing matrix elements $M_{12}(B)$ and $M_{12}(K)$ are evaluated with use of the box diagrams which contain various particles in the internal loop. In addition to the standard model contribution (W and up-type quark loops), the following diagrams contribute to $M_{12}(B/K)$ in MSSM:

1. charged Higgs – up-type quark loops and charged Higgs – W – up-type quark loops,
2. chargino – up-type squark loops,
3. gluino – down-type squark loops,
4. neutralino – down-type squark loops and neutralino – gluino – down-type squark loops.

The contribution from the box diagrams involving neutralinos is estimated to be smaller than the gluino contribution and is neglected in the present calculation. Furthermore we neglect the contribution from diagrams with right-handed external

quark lines since the flavor mixing in the right-handed sector is small in the minimal SUGRA model [20]. Consequently, our formulae for $M_{12}(B)$ are given by the following expressions. In the standard model and the charged Higgs contributions $A_{\text{SM}}(B)$ and $A_{H^\pm}(B)$ we have taken the $m_{u,c} \rightarrow 0$ limit since these contributions are negligible compared to the top mass contributions:

$$M_{12}(B) = \frac{\hat{B}_B \eta_B f_B^2 M_B}{384 \pi^2} \left[A_{\text{SM}}(B) + A_{H^\pm}(B) + A_{\chi^\pm}(B) + A_{\tilde{g}}(B) \right] , \quad (2.9a)$$

$$A_{\text{SM}}(B) = \frac{g_2^4}{m_W^2} (V_{td}^* V_{tb})^2 F_1(x_t) , \quad (2.9b)$$

$$A_{H^\pm}(B) = \frac{g_2^4}{m_W^2 \tan^2 \beta} (V_{td}^* V_{tb})^2 x_t^2 \left[\frac{1}{4 x_H \tan^2 \beta} G_1(x_t^H, x_t^H) + \frac{1}{2} G_1'(x_t, x_t, x_H) - 2 G_0'(x_t, x_t, x_H) \right] , \quad (2.9c)$$

$$A_{\chi^\pm}(B) = \sum_{\alpha, \beta=1}^2 \sum_{I, J=1}^6 \frac{g_2^2}{M_C^{\alpha 2}} \left[(\tilde{U}_U^\dagger)_1^I (U_+^\dagger)_\alpha^1 + (\tilde{U}_U^{\dagger\prime})_1^I (U_+^\dagger)_\alpha^2 \right] \times \left[(\tilde{U}_U')_J^3 (U_+)_{1^\alpha} + (\tilde{U}_U'')_J^3 (U_+)_{2^\alpha} \right] \times \left[(\tilde{U}_U^\dagger)_1^J (U_+^\dagger)_\beta^1 + (\tilde{U}_U^{\dagger\prime})_1^J (U_+^\dagger)_\beta^2 \right] \times \left[(\tilde{U}_U')_I^3 (U_+)_{1^\beta} + (\tilde{U}_U'')_I^3 (U_+)_{2^\beta} \right] G_1'(x_I^\alpha, x_J^\alpha, x_\beta^\alpha) , \quad (2.9d)$$

$$A_{\tilde{g}}(B) = \sum_{I, J=1}^6 \frac{g_3^4}{M_3^2} (\tilde{U}_D^\dagger)_1^I (\tilde{U}_D')_I^3 (\tilde{U}_D^\dagger)_1^J (\tilde{U}_D')_J^3 \times \left\{ \frac{22}{9} G_1(x_I^{\tilde{g}}, x_J^{\tilde{g}}) + \frac{8}{9} G_0(x_I^{\tilde{g}}, x_J^{\tilde{g}}) \right\} . \quad (2.9e)$$

Here, the mixing matrices $\tilde{U}_{U,D}'$ and $\tilde{U}_U''$ are defined as

$$(\tilde{U}_{U,D}')_I^j \equiv (\tilde{U}_{U,D})_I^k (V_{\text{KM}})_k^j , \quad (2.10a)$$

$$(\tilde{U}_U'')_I^j \equiv (\tilde{U}_U)^{k+3} \frac{m_k^{(u)}}{\sqrt{2} m_W \sin \beta} (V_{\text{KM}})_k^j , \quad (2.10b)$$

where $m_k^{(u)}$ ($k = 1, 2, 3$) is up-type quark mass; M_C^α and U_+ are the eigenvalue and the diagonalizing matrix of the chargino mass matrix $\mathcal{M}_C$:

$$U_-^\dagger \mathcal{M}_C U_+ = - \begin{pmatrix} M_C^1 & 0 \\ 0 & M_C^2 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\mathcal{M}_C = \begin{pmatrix} M_2 & \sqrt{2}m_W \sin \beta \\ -\sqrt{2}m_W \cos \beta & -\mu \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.11)$$

The variables x 's are defined as $x_t = m_t^2/m_W^2$, $x_H = m_{H^\pm}^2/m_W^2$, $x_t^H = x_t/x_H$, $x_I^\alpha = m_{\tilde{u}_I}^2/M_C^{\alpha 2}$, $x_\beta^\alpha = M_C^{\beta 2}/M_C^{\alpha 2}$ and $\tilde{x}_I^g = m_{\tilde{d}_I}^2/M_3^2$ with the gluino mass M_3 , and the Inami-Lim functions $F_{1,2}$, $G_{0,1}$ and $G'_{0,1}$ are listed in Appendix A. We evaluate all masses and mixing matrices at the electroweak scale neglecting the electroweak and SUSY threshold corrections. Overall factors $\hat{B}_B$, f_B , M_B and η_B are the bag parameter, decay constant, B meson mass and the QCD factor below the weak scale, respectively. We use the one-loop formula for η_B (see Appendix B), which is sufficient for the present purpose, since our main interest is to study the ratio to the SM value and hence the overall factor is irrelevant. For $M_{12}(K)$, terms with the first order of $x_c = m_c^2(m_W)/m_W^2$ have to be included in the standard model contribution A_{SM} and in the charged Higgs contribution $A_{H^\pm}$:

$$M_{12}(K) = \frac{\hat{B}_K \eta_K f_K^2 M_K}{384\pi^2} [A_{\text{SM}}(K) + A_{H^\pm}(K) + A_{\chi^\pm}(K) + A_{\tilde{g}}(K)] \quad (2.12a)$$

$$A_{\text{SM}}(K) = \frac{g_2^4}{m_W^2} \left\{ (V_{cd}^* V_{cs})^2 \hat{\eta}_1 x_c + (V_{td}^* V_{ts})^2 F_1(x_t) \right. \\ \left. + 2 (V_{cd}^* V_{cs}) (V_{td}^* V_{ts}) [x_c F_2(x_t) - \hat{\eta}_2 x_c \log x_c] \right\}, \quad (2.12b)$$

$$A_{H^\pm}(K) = \frac{g_2^4}{m_W^2 \tan^2 \beta} \left\{ (V_{td}^* V_{ts})^2 x_t^2 \left[\frac{1}{4x_H \tan^2 \beta} G_1(x_t^H, x_t^H) \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. + \frac{1}{2} G'_1(x_t, x_t, x_H) - 2G'_0(x_t, x_t, x_H) \right] \right. \\ \left. + 2 (V_{cd}^* V_{cs}) (V_{td}^* V_{ts}) x_c x_t \left[\frac{1}{4x_H \tan^2 \beta} G_1(x_c^H, x_t^H) \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. + \frac{1}{2} G'_1(x_c, x_t, x_H) - 2G'_0(x_c, x_t, x_H) \right] \right\}. \quad (2.12c)$$

Since the QCD correction factors for the diagrams including internal charm and up quarks are different from that for the top loop, we have included the extra QCD factors $\hat{\eta}_{1,2}$ in $A_{\text{SM}}(K)$ [21]. Explicit forms of η_K and $\hat{\eta}_{1,2}$ are given in Appendix B. The SUSY contributions $A_{\chi^\pm}(K)$ and $A_{\tilde{g}}(K)$ are obtained from the formulae for $B^0-\bar{B}^0$ mixing (2.9d) and (2.9e) by an appropriate change of the flavor indices. Then the $B^0-\bar{B}^0$ mass splitting ΔM_B and the CP violation parameter ϵ_K are obtained from $M_{12}(B)$ and $M_{12}(K)$ as

$$\Delta M_B = 2|M_{12}(B)|, \quad (2.13a)$$

$$\epsilon_K = e^{i\pi/4} \frac{\text{Im} M_{12}(K)}{\sqrt{2}\Delta M_K}, \quad (2.13b)$$

respectively. The experimental value for the K_L-K_S mass splitting is given as $\Delta M_K = 3.51 \times 10^{-12}$ MeV, and we have used the experimental result $\Delta\Gamma_K \approx -2\Delta M_K$ in Eq. (2.13b). Note that the contributions from penguin diagrams is omitted to derive (2.13b). In the minimal SUGRA model, as well as SM, the ϵ_K is estimated to be dominated by the box contributions.

III Numerical results

Following the method described in Ref. [20], we investigate the three dimensional parameter space $\{m_0, M_{gX}, A_X\}$ within the ranges $m_0, M_{gX} < 2$ TeV and $|A_X| < 5m_0$ for a given set of $\tan\beta$ and CKM parameters $|V_{us}|$, $|V_{cb}|$, $|V_{ub}|/|V_{cb}|$ and δ_{13} , where δ_{13} is the CP violating phase in the standard parametrization [18] and is defined as $e^{-i\delta_{13}} = V_{ub}/|V_{ub}|$. Then we repeat the whole procedure varying $\tan\beta$ and the CKM parameters. The top quark mass is fixed to $m_t = 175$ GeV at the electroweak scale [12]. In order to obtain the allowed region in the parameter space, we require each calculated point to satisfy the following phenomenological constraints [18] beside the condition for the radiative electroweak symmetry breaking scenario [11]:

1. $b \rightarrow s \gamma$ inclusive branching ratio. It is known that the $b \rightarrow s \gamma$ branching ratio is approximately independent of δ_{13} and gives a unique constraint on the SUSY parameter space [4, 5, 6]. For the detail procedure to put a constraint

on the SUSY parameter space, see Ref. [6]. The measurement by CLEO [13] requires $1 \times 10^{-4} < \text{Br}(b \rightarrow s\gamma) < 4.2 \times 10^{-4}$;

2. The mass of any charged SUSY particle is larger than 45 GeV;
3. All sneutrino mass are larger than 41 GeV;
4. The gluino mass is larger than 100 GeV [16];
5. Neutralino search results at LEP [17], which require $\Gamma(Z \rightarrow \chi\chi) < 8.4 \text{ MeV}$, $\text{Br}(Z \rightarrow \chi\chi')$, $\text{Br}(Z \rightarrow \chi'\chi') < 2 \times 10^{-5}$, where χ is the lightest neutralino and χ' is any neutralino other than the lightest one;
6. The lightest SUSY particle (LSP) is neutral;
7. The condition for not having a charge or color symmetry breaking vacuum [22].

In the following, we show our results for θ_B , ΔM_B and ϵ_K .

III.1 θ_B

In Fig. 1, we show the complex value of $M_{12}(B)$ for fixed $\tan\beta = 3$ and CKM parameters $|V_{us}| = 0.221$, $|V_{cb}| = 0.041$ and $|V_{ub}|/|V_{cb}| = 0.08$ with four choices of $\delta_{13} = \pi/6, \pi/3, \pi/2$ and $2\pi/3$. The axes are normalized to the prefactor $\hat{B}_B \eta_B f_B^2 M_B / 384 \pi^2$ in (2.9a). Each dot shows the value of $M_{12}(B)$ in the minimal SUGRA model and each cross represents the SM value. We see that all SUGRA points lie along the line connecting the origin and the corresponding SM point, which shows that θ_B in the minimal SUGRA model is equal to the SM value with the same CKM parameters. This fact is known previously [7, 8] by analyses with the approximate solutions of the RGEs where Yukawa couplings other than that of top quark are neglected. Our numerical result confirms and extends the previous analyses on this point. We have also checked that the result is independent of $\tan\beta$. Phenomenologically, this has an important consequence that the CP asymmetry measurements in various B decay modes including $B \rightarrow J/\psi K_S$ gives a direct information on the ρ and η parameters just as in SM even if there are new contributions to ΔM_B and/or ϵ_K ; if the phase in the new contributions to $M_{12}(B)$ were different from the phase of

the SM contribution, the relation between the CP asymmetries in B decays and the CKM parameters would be modified and hence one could not read CKM parameters directly from the measured CP asymmetries.

III.2 ΔM_B

As can be seen in Fig. 1, SUSY and charged Higgs contributions to the magnitude of $M_{12}(B)$ are all *constructive* in the whole allowed parameter space. We show the ratio of ΔM_B in the minimal SUGRA model $\Delta M_B(\text{SUGRA})$ to the SM value $\Delta M_B(\text{SM})$ as functions of the charged Higgs mass $m_{H^\pm}$ and the lighter scalar top mass $m_{\tilde{t}_1}$ for $\tan\beta = 3$ and 10 in Fig. 2a – Fig. 2d. δ_{13} is fixed to $\pi/3$ and other CKM parameters are the same as those in Fig. 1. Each solid line in Fig. 2a and Fig. 2c shows the value in THDM II with the same $\tan\beta$ and CKM parameters. For a small $\tan\beta = 3$, main non-SM contributions to ΔM_B come from both the charged Higgs loop (2.9c) and the chargino loop (2.9d) while the gluino contribution (2.9e) is relatively small. The total $\Delta M_B(\text{SUGRA})$ increases by $\sim 20\%$ of the SM value for a charged Higgs mass $\lesssim 300$ GeV. On the other hand, for a large $\tan\beta = 10$, the charged Higgs contribution is suppressed as $\sim 1/\tan^2\beta$. In that case, the dominant non-SM contribution comes from the chargino loop only. Fig. 2b and Fig. 2d show that a relatively light scalar top is necessary for a large chargino – scalar-top loop contribution for both choices of $\tan\beta$.

In order to investigate the CKM parameter dependences of $\Delta M_B(\text{SUGRA})/\Delta M_B(\text{SM})$, we varied the CKM parameters within the range $|V_{ub}|/|V_{cb}| = 0.08 \pm 0.03$ and $0 < \delta_{13} < \pi$. We find that the change of the non-SM part of $M_{12}(B)$ normalized to the SM value is less than $O(10^{-4})$. Combining with the result on θ_B , one can see that the whole (ρ, η) dependence of the complex number $M_{12}(B)$ is common to the SM and the non-SM parts and is canceled out in the ratio $\Delta M_B(\text{SUGRA})/\Delta M_B(\text{SM})$ in a good accuracy.

The lower and the upper bounds of the ratio $\Delta M_B(\text{SUGRA})/\Delta M_B(\text{SM})$ in the parameter space $\{m_{H^\pm}, \tan\beta\}$ are shown in Fig. 3a and Fig. 3b, respectively. Here we fix the CKM parameters to the same values as those in Fig. 2a – Fig. 2d since the result does not depend on the choice of the CKM parameters. The range of the $\tan\beta$ we have scanned is $2 \lesssim \tan\beta \lesssim 55$. For the values of $\tan\beta$ smaller or larger than this range the Yukawa coupling constant for top or bottom/tau blows up

below the grand unification scale[†]. We see that the largest enhancement on ΔM_B ($\Delta M_B(\text{SUGRA})/\Delta M_B(\text{SM}) \gtrsim 1.2$) is realized for small $\tan\beta \lesssim 4$ and $m_{H^\pm} \lesssim 400$ GeV. In this parameter region, a relatively light scalar top $m_{\tilde{t}_1} \lesssim 200$ GeV also exists and hence both charged Higgs loop and chargino and scalar top loop contribute to $\Delta M_B(\text{SUGRA})$ sizably.

Let us now consider what would change if LEP II should not find any SUSY signal. Since the upper bound of $\Delta M_B(\text{SUGRA})/\Delta M_B(\text{SM})$ for given $\tan\beta$ and $m_{H^\pm}$ is essentially determined by the lower bounds for the masses of SUSY particles, chargino and/or scalar top, in particular, a parameter region with relatively large $\Delta M_B(\text{SUGRA})/\Delta M_B(\text{SM})$ is excluded if the lower bound of the SUSY particle masses is raised to ~ 90 GeV. As a result, the upper bound of $\Delta M_B(\text{SUGRA})/\Delta M_B(\text{SM})$ shown in Fig. 3b decreases considerably, while the lower bound of the charged Higgs mass for each $\tan\beta$ is also raised. On the other hand, the lower bound of $\Delta M_B(\text{SUGRA})/\Delta M_B(\text{SM})$ shown in Fig. 3a is insensitive to the lower bound of the SUSY particle masses because the bound is essentially determined by the requirement of the radiative electroweak symmetry breaking. Therefore, the only change in Fig. 3a after the LEP II constraint is that the excluded region of the charged Higgs mass is extended by ~ 50 GeV (see Ref. [6]), though the contours themselves are not changed much.

III.3 ϵ_K

Fig. 4a – Fig. 4d show scatter plots of the ratio $|\epsilon_K(\text{SUGRA})|/|\epsilon_K(\text{SM})|$. In comparison with the corresponding figures for $\Delta M_B(\text{SUGRA})/\Delta M_B(\text{SM})$, Fig. 2a – Fig. 2d, respectively, we see that $|\epsilon_K(\text{SUGRA})|/|\epsilon_K(\text{SM})|$ and $\Delta M_B(\text{SUGRA})/\Delta M_B(\text{SM})$ have quite similar characteristics. We find actually that there is a linear relation between $\Delta M_B(\text{SUGRA})/\Delta M_B(\text{SM})$ and $|\epsilon_K(\text{SUGRA})|/|\epsilon_K(\text{SM})|$, which is shown in Fig. 5. Here, CKM parameters are fixed to the same values as those in Fig. 2a with $\tan\beta = 3$. This linear relation comes from the fact that the SUSY contributions to both $M_{12}(B)$ and $M_{12}(K)$ are dominated by the box diagram with the scalar top and the chargino loop, hence the enhancement factor is common. The small deviation

[†] Precisely speaking, our calculation does not apply for very large $\tan\beta \sim 55$ where the large bottom Yukawa coupling constant induces the new operators involving the right-handed bottom quark.

of $\frac{\Delta M_B(\text{SUGRA})/\Delta M_B(\text{SM})}{|\epsilon_K(\text{SUGRA})|/|\epsilon_K(\text{SM})|}$ from unity seen in Fig. 5 is due to the contributions from charm quark. In fact, we have checked that the enhancement factors for ΔM_B and ϵ_K coincide with each other if we neglect the charm quark contributions to ϵ_K (see (2.12b) and (2.12c)). This fact is previously noticed in Ref. [8], in which a simplified form of squark mass matrices is assumed[‡]. We have numerically confirmed this point in the minimal SUGRA model.

IV Conclusions

In this paper we have made an extensive analysis on $B^0-\overline{B}^0$ mixing and ϵ_K parameter in the minimal SUGRA model. We have found that the present experimental constraints including the recent measurement of $b \rightarrow s \gamma$ branching ratio still allows for +20% deviation from the SM of both ΔM_B and $|\epsilon_K|$. We also found that the enhancement factors for ΔM_B and $|\epsilon_K|$ have a strong correlation. We have seen that the dependence of the ΔM_B from the SUSY contributions on the CKM matrix element is the same as that of the SM in a very good accuracy so that the ratio does not depend on ρ and η .

Let us discuss implications of these results to constrain the SUSY parameter space. Since the effect of the new particles is at most 20~30%, the present constraints from ΔM_B and ϵ_K are not very strong. This is because the CKM parameters (ρ , η) are not determined precisely from the other measurements. Since we do not assume the SM, the only available information on (ρ , η) is given by the measurement of $|V_{ub}|/|V_{cb}|$ which corresponds to $\sqrt{\rho^2 + \eta^2} = 0.36 \pm 0.14$. The situation, however, will change when the CKM parameters are more precisely determined from the measurements of the CP asymmetry in B decays at the future B -factories. Since the phase of the $B^0-\overline{B}^0$ mixing amplitude in the minimal SUGRA is the same as that in the SM, the CP asymmetries in B -decays such as $B \rightarrow J/\psi K_S$ are directly related to the CKM parameters just as in the SM case. Therefore, it will be possible to extract 10~20% effects from the new particles after the CKM parameters are determined with enough precision in the future. It is thus important to measure CP violating asymmetries in various modes of B decay, not just in $B \rightarrow J/\psi K_S$ mode, and to reduce the ambiguities on the hadron matrix elements f_B , $\hat{B}_B$ and $\hat{B}_K$ from

[‡] The ratio $\Delta M_B(\text{SUGRA})/\Delta M_B(\text{SM})$ corresponds to the parameter R in Ref. [8].

theoretical and/or experimental improvements. It is interesting to note that the parameter region in the $\tan\beta - m_{H^\pm}$ space which has the largest enhancements in ΔM_B and ϵ_K corresponds to relatively small values of $\tan\beta$ and $m_{H^\pm}$, *i.e.* $\tan\beta \lesssim 10$ and $m_{H^\pm} \lesssim 300$ GeV. This region roughly coincides with the parameter region in which the Higgs search might be difficult at the LHC experiments [23] if the LEP II experiments fail to find any signal of the Higgs boson. It may be possible, however, that the B -factory experiments will find whether this parameter region is favored or not before the LHC experiments start.

Acknowledgment

The authors would like to thank K. Hikasa and J. Arafune for carefully reading the manuscript and giving useful comments. The work of Y. O. is supported in part by the Grant-in-aid for Scientific Research from the Ministry of Education, Science and Culture of Japan.

Appendix A Functions from loop integrals

The Inami-Lim functions used in Eqs. (2.9b)–(2.9e) and Eqs. (2.12b), (2.12c) are the following:

$$F_1(x) = \frac{1}{(x-1)^2} \left\{ \frac{3x^3}{2(x-1)} \log x + x - \frac{11}{4}x^2 + \frac{1}{4}x^3 \right\}, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

$$F_2(x) = \log x - \frac{3x}{4(x-1)} \left\{ \frac{x}{x-1} \log x - 1 \right\}, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

$$G_0(x, y) = \frac{1}{x-y} \left\{ \frac{x}{(x-1)^2} \log x - \frac{1}{x-1} - (x \leftrightarrow y) \right\}, \quad (\text{A.3})$$

$$G_1(x, y) = \frac{1}{x-y} \left\{ \frac{x^2}{(x-1)^2} \log x - \frac{1}{x-1} - (x \leftrightarrow y) \right\}, \quad (\text{A.4})$$

$$G'_0(x, y, z) = \frac{1}{x-y} \left\{ \frac{1}{x-z} \left[\frac{x}{(x-1)} \log x - \frac{z}{(z-1)} \log z \right] - (x \leftrightarrow y) \right\} \quad (\text{A.5})$$

$$G'_1(x, y, z) = \frac{1}{x-y} \left\{ \frac{1}{x-z} \left[\frac{x^2}{(x-1)} \log x - \frac{z^2}{(z-1)} \log z \right] - (x \leftrightarrow y) \right\} \quad (\text{A.6})$$

Appendix B QCD factors

We use the following formulae for the QCD factors η_B , η_K and $\hat{\eta}_{1,2}$ in (2.9a), (2.12a) and (2.12b), respectively, which are obtained with one-loop calculations [21]. We have neglected the threshold corrections near the electroweak scale:

$$\eta_B = \alpha_s(m_W)^{6/23}, \quad (\text{B.1})$$

$$\eta_K = \alpha_s(m_c)^{6/27} \left(\frac{\alpha_s(m_b)}{\alpha_s(m_c)} \right)^{6/25} \left(\frac{\alpha_s(m_W)}{\alpha_s(m_b)} \right)^{6/23}, \quad (\text{B.2})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\eta}_1 = & \frac{3}{2} \left(\frac{\alpha_s(m_b)}{\alpha_s(m_c)} \right)^{-18/25} \left(\frac{\alpha_s(m_W)}{\alpha_s(m_b)} \right)^{-18/23} \\ & - \left(\frac{\alpha_s(m_b)}{\alpha_s(m_c)} \right)^{-36/25} \left(\frac{\alpha_s(m_W)}{\alpha_s(m_b)} \right)^{-36/23} \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\alpha_s(m_b)}{\alpha_s(m_c)} \right)^{-54/25} \left(\frac{\alpha_s(m_W)}{\alpha_s(m_b)} \right)^{-54/23}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.3})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\eta}_2 = & \frac{2\pi}{\alpha_s(m_W) \log x_c} \left\{ \frac{9}{7} \left(\frac{\alpha_s(m_b)}{\alpha_s(m_c)} \right)^{7/25} \left(\frac{\alpha_s(m_W)}{\alpha_s(m_b)} \right)^{5/23} \right. \\ & + \frac{35}{18} \left(\frac{\alpha_s(m_W)}{\alpha_s(m_b)} \right)^{5/23} + \frac{6}{11} \left(\frac{\alpha_s(m_b)}{\alpha_s(m_c)} \right)^{-11/25} \left(\frac{\alpha_s(m_W)}{\alpha_s(m_b)} \right)^{-13/23} \\ & - \frac{12}{143} \left(\frac{\alpha_s(m_W)}{\alpha_s(m_b)} \right)^{-13/23} - \frac{3}{29} \left(\frac{\alpha_s(m_b)}{\alpha_s(m_c)} \right)^{-29/25} \left(\frac{\alpha_s(m_W)}{\alpha_s(m_b)} \right)^{-31/23} \\ & \left. + \frac{6}{899} \left(\frac{\alpha_s(m_W)}{\alpha_s(m_b)} \right)^{-31/23} - \frac{4362}{2015} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.4})$$

References

- [1] J. Ellis and D.V. Nanopoulos, *Phys. Lett.* **110B**, 44 (1982);
R. Barbieri and R. Gatto, *Phys. Lett.* **110B**, 211 (1982);
T. Inami and C.S. Lim, *Nucl. Phys.* **B207**, 533 (1982);
F. Gabbiani and A. Masiero, *Nucl. Phys.* **B322**, 235 (1989).
- [2] J. Ellis, S. Ferrara and D.V. Nanopoulos, *Phys. Lett.* **114B**, 231 (1982);
S.P. Chia and S. Nandi, *Phys. Lett.* **117B**, 45 (1982);
W. Buchmüller and D. Wyler, *Phys. Lett.* **121B**, 321 (1983);
J. Polchinski and M.B. Wise, *Phys. Lett.* **125B**, 393 (1983);
F. del Águila, M.B. Gavela, J.A. Grifols and A. Méndez, *Phys. Lett.* **126B**, 71 (1983);
Y. Kizukuri and N. Oshimo, *Phys. Rev. D* **45**, 1806 (1992); *Phys. Rev. D* **46**, 3025 (1992);
T. Inui, Y. Mimura, N. Sakai and T. Sasaki, *Nucl. Phys. B* **449**, 49 (1995).
- [3] A. Bouquet, J. Kaplan and C.A. Savoy, *Phys. Lett.* **148B**, 69 (1984);
Nucl. Phys. **B262**, 299 (1985).
- [4] S. Bertolini, F. Borzumati, A. Masiero, and G. Ridolfi, *Nucl. Phys. B* **353**, 591 (1991).
- [5] N. Oshimo, *Nucl. Phys. B* **404**, 20 (1993);
J. Hewett, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70**, 1045 (1993);
V. Barger, M. Berger, and R.J.N. Phillips, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70**, 1368 (1993);
R. Barbieri and G.F. Giudice, *Phys. Lett. B* **309**, 86 (1993);
J.L. Lopez, D.V. Nanopoulos, and G.T. Park, *Phys. Rev. D* **48**, 974 (1993);
J.L. Lopez, D.V. Nanopoulos, G.T. Park, and A. Zichichi, *Phys. Rev. D* **49**, 355 (1994);
Y. Okada, *Phys. Lett. B* **315**, 119 (1993);
R. Garisto and J.N. Ng, *Phys. Lett. B* **315**, 372 (1993);
M.A. Diaz, *Phys. Lett. B* **322**, 207 (1994);
F.M. Borzumati, *Z. Phys. C* **63**, 291 (1994);
S. Bertolini and F. Vissani, *SISSA preprint* SISSA 40/94/EP, March 1994;

- J. Wu, P. Nath, and R. Arnowitt, *Phys. Rev.* **D 51**, 1371 (1995);
P. Nath and R. Arnowitt, *Phys. Lett.* **B 336**, 395 (1994); *CERN preprint* CERN-TH-7363-94, July 1994;
F.M. Borzumati, M. Drees, and M.M. Nojiri, *Phys. Rev.* **D 51**, 341 (1995);
J.L. Lopez, D.V. Nanopoulos, X. Wang, and A. Zichichi, *Phys. Rev.* **D 51**, 147 (1995);
G. Kane, C. Kolda, L. Roszkowski, and D. Wells, *Phys. Rev.* **D 49**, 6173 (1994);
M. Carena, M. Olechowski, S. Pokorski and C.E.M. Wagner, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 426**, 269 (1994);
C. Kolda, L. Roszkowski, D. Wells, and G. Kane, *Phys. Rev.* **D 50**, 3498 (1994);
B. de Carlos and J.A. Casas, *Phys. Lett.* **B 349**, 1995 (300); Erratum—*ibid.* **B 351**, 1995 (604).
- [6] T. Goto and Y. Okada, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **94**, 407 (1995).
- [7] L.J. Hall, V.A. Kostelecky and S. Raby, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 267**, 415 (1986);
T. Kurimoto, *Phys. Rev.* **D 39**, 3447 (1989); *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A 10**, 1577 (1995);
J.S. Hagelin, S. Kelley and T. Tanaka, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A 8**, 2737 (1993);
Nucl. Phys. **B 415**, 293 (1994).
- [8] G.C. Branco, G.C. Cho, Y. Kizukuri and N. Oshimo, *Phys. Lett.* **B 337**, 316 (1994); *Nucl. Phys.* **B 449**, 483 (1995).
- [9] T.G. Rizzo, *Phys. Rev.* **D 38**, 820 (1988);
W.-S. Hou and R.S. Wiley, *Phys. Lett.* **B 202**, 591 (1988);
C.Q. Geng and J.N. Ng, *Phys. Rev.* **D 38**, 2857 (1988);
V. Barger, J.L. Hewett and R.J.N. Phillips, *Phys. Rev.* **D 41**, 3421 (1990).
- [10] As a review, see H.P. Nilles, *Phys. Rep.* **110**, 1 (1984).
- [11] K. Inoue, A. Kakuto, H. Komatsu and S. Takeshita, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **68**, 927 (1982); *ibid.* **71**, 413 (1984);
L. Ibáñez and G.G. Ross, *Phys. Lett.* **110B**, 215 (1982);
L. Alvarez-Gaumé, J. Polchinski and M.B. Wise, *Nucl. Phys.* **B221**, 495 (1983);

- J. Ellis, J.S. Hagelin, D.V. Nanopoulos and K. Tamvakis, *Phys. Lett.* **125B**, 275 (1983).
- [12] F. Abe *et al.* (CDF Collaboration), *FNAL preprint* Fermilab-Pub-95/022-E (hep-ex/9503002) (1995);
S. Abachi *et al.* (D0 Collaboration), *FNAL preprint* Fermilab-Pub-95/028-E (hep-ex/9503003) (1995).
- [13] M.S. Alam *et al.* (CLEO Collaboration), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **74**, 2885 (1995).
- [14] L. Wolfenstein, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 160**, 501 (1979).
- [15] Y. Okada, M. Yamaguchi and T. Yanagida, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **85**, 1 (1991);
Phys. Lett. **B 262**, 54 (1991);
J. Ellis, G. Ridolfi and F. Zwirner, *Phys. Lett.* **B 257**, 83 (1991).
- [16] F. Abe *et al.* (CDF Collaboration), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75**, 613 (1995); *ibid.* **69**, 3439 (1992);
S. Abachi *et al.* (D0 Collaboration), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75**, 618 (1995).
- [17] M. Acciarri *et al.* (L3 Collaboration), *Phys. Lett.* **B 350**, 109 (1995);
D. Decamp, *et al.* (ALEPH Collaboration), *Phys. Rep.* **216**, 253 (1992).
- [18] L. Montanet, *et al.* (Particle Data Group), *Phys. Rev.* **D 50**, 1173 (1994).
- [19] L. Wolfenstein, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **51**, 1945 (1983).
- [20] T. Goto, T. Nihei and J. Arafune, *Phys. Rev.* **D 52**, 505 (1995).
- [21] G. Altarelli and L. Maiani, *Phys. Lett.* **52B**, 351 (1974);
M.K. Gaillard and B.W. Lee, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **33**, 108 (1974);
F.J. Gilman and M.B. Wise, *Phys. Rev.* **D 27**, 1128 (1983);
J.-M. Frère, W.A. Kaufman and Y.-P. Yao, *Phys. Rev.* **D 36**, 809 (1987);
W.A. Kaufman, H. Steger, Y.-P. Yao, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A 3**, 1479 (1988);
A. Datta, J. Fröhlich and E.A. Paschos, *Z. Phys.* **C 46**, 63 (1990);
A.J. Buras, M. Jamin and P.H. Weisz, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 347**, 491 (1990);
J.M. Flynn, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A5**, 877 (1990).

- [22] J.P. Derendinger and C.A. Savoy, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 237**, 307 (1984).
- [23] W.W. Armstrong *et al.* (ATLAS Collaboration), *ATLAS technical report*, CERN/LHCC/94-43, LHCC/P2, December 1994.

Figure Captions

FIG. 1 $M_{12}(B)$ normalized to $\hat{B}_B \eta_B f_B^2 M_B / 384 \pi^2$ for $\delta_{13} = \pi/6, \pi/3, \pi/2$ and $2\pi/3$ with fixed $m_t = 175$ GeV, $\tan \beta = 3$, $|V_{us}| = 0.221$, $|V_{cb}| = 0.041$ and $|V_{ub}|/|V_{cb}| = 0.08$. The cross represents the standard model value.

FIG. 2a Ratio of ΔM_B in the minimal SUGRA model to the standard model value as a function of the charged Higgs mass with fixed $m_t = 175$ GeV, $\tan \beta = 3$, $|V_{us}| = 0.221$, $|V_{cb}| = 0.041$, $|V_{ub}|/|V_{cb}| = 0.08$ and $\delta_{13} = \pi/3$. The solid line shows the value in THDM II.

FIG. 2b Ratio of ΔM_B in the minimal SUGRA model to the standard model value as a function of the lighter scalar top mass with the same parameters as those in Fig. 2a.

FIG. 2c Same as Fig. 2a for $\tan \beta = 10$.

FIG. 2d Same as Fig. 2b for $\tan \beta = 10$.

FIG. 3a Contour plot for the minimal value of $\Delta M_B(\text{SUGRA})/\Delta M_B(\text{SM})$ on $m_{H^\pm} - \tan \beta$ plane. Each number attached to each contour line represents the value of $\Delta M_B(\text{SUGRA})/\Delta M_B(\text{SM})$.

FIG. 3b Contour plot for the maximal value of $\Delta M_B(\text{SUGRA})/\Delta M_B(\text{SM})$ on $m_{H^\pm} - \tan \beta$ plane. Each number attached to each contour line represents the value of $\Delta M_B(\text{SUGRA})/\Delta M_B(\text{SM})$.

FIG. 4a Ratio of $|\epsilon_K|$ in the minimal SUGRA model to the standard model value as a function of the charged Higgs mass with the same parameters as those in Fig. 2a.

FIG. 4b Ratio of $|\epsilon_K|$ in the minimal SUGRA model to the standard model value as a function of the lighter scalar top mass with the same parameters as those in Fig. 2a.

FIG. 4c Same as Fig. 4a for $\tan \beta = 10$.

FIG. 4d Same as Fig. 4b for $\tan \beta = 10$.

FIG. 5 Correlation between the enhancement factors $\Delta M_B(\text{SUGRA})/\Delta M_B(\text{SM})$ and $|\epsilon_K(\text{SUGRA})|/|\epsilon_K(\text{SM})|$. Parameters are fixed to the same values as those in Fig. 2a.

Figures

FIG. 1: $M_{12}(B)$ normalized to $\hat{B}_B \eta_B f_B^2 M_B / 384 \pi^2$ for $\delta_{13} = \pi/6, \pi/3, \pi/2$ and $2\pi/3$ with fixed $m_t = 175$ GeV, $\tan \beta = 3$, $|V_{us}| = 0.221$, $|V_{cb}| = 0.041$ and $|V_{ub}|/|V_{cb}| = 0.08$. The cross represents the standard model value.

FIG. 2a: Ratio of ΔM_B in the minimal SUGRA model to the standard model value as a function of the charged Higgs mass with fixed $m_t = 175$ GeV, $\tan \beta = 3$, $|V_{us}| = 0.221$, $|V_{cb}| = 0.041$, $|V_{ub}|/|V_{cb}| = 0.08$ and $\delta_{13} = \pi/3$. The solid line shows the value in THDM II.

FIG. 2b: Ratio of ΔM_B in the minimal SUGRA model to the standard model value as a function of the lighter scalar top mass with the same parameters as those in Fig. 2a.

FIG. 2c: Same as Fig. 2a for $\tan \beta = 10$.

FIG. 2d: Same as Fig. 2b for $\tan \beta = 10$.

FIG. 3a: Contour plot for the minimal value of $\Delta M_B(\text{SUGRA})/\Delta M_B(\text{SM})$ on $m_{H^\pm} - \tan \beta$ plane. Each number attached to each contour line represents the value of $\Delta M_B(\text{SUGRA})/\Delta M_B(\text{SM})$.

FIG. 3b: Contour plot for the maximal value of $\Delta M_B(\text{SUGRA})/\Delta M_B(\text{SM})$ on $m_{H^\pm} - \tan \beta$ plane. Each number attached to each contour line represents the value of $\Delta M_B(\text{SUGRA})/\Delta M_B(\text{SM})$.

FIG. 4a: Ratio of $|\epsilon_K|$ in the minimal SUGRA model to the standard model value as a function of the charged Higgs mass with the same parameters as those in Fig. 2a.

FIG. 4b: Ratio of $|\epsilon_K|$ in the minimal SUGRA model to the standard model value as a function of the lighter scalar top mass with the same parameters as those in Fig. 2a.

FIG. 4c: Same as Fig. 4a for $\tan \beta = 10$.

FIG. 4d: Same as Fig. 4b for $\tan \beta = 10$.

FIG. 5: Correlation between the enhancement factors $\Delta M_B(\text{SUGRA})/\Delta M_B(\text{SM})$ and $|\epsilon_K(\text{SUGRA})|/|\epsilon_K(\text{SM})|$. Parameters are fixed to the same values as those in Fig. 2a.